

ANNUAL CLIENT ASSISTANCE PROGRAM (CAP) REPORT

State: INDIANA
Fiscal Year: 2008

DESIGNATED AGENCY IDENTIFICATION

Name: Indiana Protection and Advocacy Services
Address: 4701 N. Keystone Ave.
Suite 222
City: Indianapolis, IN
Zip Code: 46205
E-mail Address: sbeecher@ipas.in.gov
Website Address: http://www.in.gov/ipas
Phone: 317-722-5555
TTY : 317-722-5563
Toll-free Phone: 1-800-622-4845
Toll-free TTY: 1-800-838-1131
Fax: 317-722-5564

OPERATING AGENCY (IF DIFFERENT FROM DESIGNATED AGENCY)

Name:
Address:
City:
Zip Code:
E-mail Address:
Website Address:
Phone:
TTY:
Toll-free Phone:
Toll-free TTY:
Fax:

Name of CAP Director/Coordinator: Sue Beecher
Person to contact regarding Sue Beecher report:
Contact Person Phone: 317-722-5555

PART I. AGENCY WORKLOAD DATA

A. Information and Referral Services (I&R):

(Multiple responses are not permitted.)
Multiple responses are not permitted.

- | | |
|---|-------|
| 1. Information regarding the Rehabilitation Act | 165 |
| 2. Information regarding Title I of the ADA | 0 |
| 3. Other information provided | 22 |
| 4. Total I&R services provided (Lines A1+A2+A3) | 187 |
| 5. Individuals attending trainings by CAP staff (approximate) | 3,566 |

B. Individuals served

An individual is counted only once during a fiscal year. Multiple counts are not permitted for Lines B1-B3.

- | | |
|---|----|
| 1. Individuals who are still being served as of October 1 (carryover from prior year) | 23 |
|---|----|

2. Additional individuals who were served during the year	71
3. Total individuals served (Lines B1+B2)	94
4. Individuals (from Line B3) who had multiple case files opened/closed this year. (In unusual situations, an individual may have more than one case file opened/closed during a fiscal year. This number is not added to the total in Line B3 above.)	3

C. Individual still being served as of September 30

Carryover to next year. This total may not exceed Line I.B3. 25

D. Reasons for closing individuals' case files

Choose one primary reason for closing each case file. There may be more case files than the total number of individuals served to account for those unusual situations, referred to in Line I.B4, when an individual had multiple case files closed during the year.

1. All issues resolved in individual's favor	27
2. Some issues resolved in individual's favor (when there are multiple issues)	11
3. CAP determines VR agency position/decision was appropriate for the individual	4
4. Individual's case lacks legal merit; (inappropriate for CAP intervention)	18
5. Individual chose alternative representation	0
6. Individual decided not to pursue resolution	10
7. Appeals were unsuccessful	0
8. CAP services not needed due to individual's death, relocation, etc.	0
9. Individual refused to cooperate with CAP	3
10. CAP unable to take case due to lack of resources	0
11. Other (Please explain on separate sheet)	
1. Provided technical assistance in regards to consumer rights to reapply for VR services.	
2. Consumer was provided technical assistance in the form of VR eligibility criteria for an individual who is deaf.	

E. Results achieved for individuals

Choose one primary outcome for each closed case file. As stated in Section D. there may be more case files than the total number of individuals served.

1. Controlling law/policy explained to individual	32
2. Application for services completed.	3
3. Eligibility determination expedited	7
4. Individual participated in evaluation	3
5. IPE developed/implemented	17
6. Communication re-established between individual and other party	7
7. Individual assigned to new counselor/office	2
8. Alternative resources identified for individual	1
9. ADA/504/EEEO/OCR/ complaint made	0
10. Other (Please explain on separate sheet)	3
1. After Consumer asked for a formal review of the ineligible decision, the VR Supervisor reviewed the record and reversed counselor's decision, and made Consumer eligible for VR services thereby making an appeal unnecessary.	
2. Went up for judicial review, and the judge remanded for a new hearing. Due to difficulties, this issue was never resolved.	
3. Consumer did not respond to IPAS	

PART II. PROGRAM DATA

A. Age

As of the beginning of the fiscal year.) (Multiple responses are not permitted.)

1. 21 and under	11
2. 22 - 40	27
3. 41 - 64	53
4. 65 and over	3
5. Total (Sum of Lines A1 through A4. Total must equal Line I.B3.)	94

B. Gender

Multiple responses not permitted.

1. Females	34
2. Males	60
3. Total (Sum of Lines B1 and B2. Total must equal Line I.B3.)	94

C. Race/ethnicity

Multiple responses are permitted.

1. American Indian or Alaskan Native	1
2. Asian	1
3. Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	0
4. Black or African American	9
5. Hispanic or Latino	2
6. White	80
7. Race/ethnicity unknown	1

D. Primary disabling condition of individuals served

Multiple responses not permitted.

1. Blindness (both eyes)	3
2. Other visual impairments	1
3. Deafness	12
4. Hard of hearing	11
5. Deaf-blind	0
6. Orthopedic impairments	25
7. Absense of extremities	0
8. Mental illness	15
9. Substance abuse (alcohol or drugs)	2
10. Mental retardation	2
11. Specific learning disabilities (SLD)	7
12. Neurological disorders	6
13. Respiratory disorders	1
14. Heart and other circulatory conditions	2
15. Digestive disorders	2
16. Genitourinary conditions	0
17. Speech Impairments	0
18. AIDS/HIV positive	1
19. Traumatic brain injury (TBI)	4
20. All other disabilities	0
21. Disabilities not known	0
22. Total (Sum of Lines D1 through D21. Total must equal Line I. B3.)	

E. Types of individuals served

Multiple responses permitted.

1. Applicants of VR Program	38
2. Clients of VR Program	36

- | | |
|--|---|
| 3. Applicants or clients of IL Program | 0 |
| 4. Applicants or clients of other programs and projects funded under the Act | 1 |

F. Source of individual's concern

Multiple responses permitted.

- | | |
|--|----|
| 1. VR agency only | 91 |
| 2. Other Rehabilitation Act sources only | 0 |
| 3. Both VR agency and other Rehabilitation Act sources | 4 |
| 4. Employer | 0 |

G. Problem areas

Multiple responses permitted.

- | | |
|--|----|
| 1. Individual requests information | 3 |
| 2. Communication problems between individual and counselor | 6 |
| 3. Conflict about services to be provided | 55 |
| 4. Related to application/eligibility process | 30 |
| 5. Related to IPE development/implementation | 2 |
| 6. Other Rehabilitation Act-related problems | 0 |
| 7. Non-Rehabilitation Act related | 0 |
| 8. Related to Title I of the ADA | 0 |

H. Types of CAP services provided

Choose one primary service CAP provided for each closed case file. As stated above, there may be more case files than actual individuals served.

- | | |
|-----------------------------------|----|
| 1. Information/referral | 2 |
| 2. Advisory/interpretational | 43 |
| 3. Negotiation | 20 |
| 4. Administrative/informal review | 2 |
| 5. Alternative dispute resolution | 2 |
| 6. Formal appeal/fair hearing | 3 |
| 7. Legal remedy | 1 |
| 8. Transportation | 0 |

PART III. NARRATIVE

Refer to pages 16-19 of the instructions for guidelines on the contents of the narrative.

- a. Type of agency used to administer CAP: Identify the type of agency used to administer the CAP and type of agency operating the CAP, if different.

Indiana Protection and Advocacy Services is an external protection and advocacy agency.

- b. Sources of funds expended: Specify the total expenditures of funds used in providing services to CAP-eligible individuals according to the source of funding. Provide this information even if the agency's only source of funding is the Federal formula grant. The following chart is recommended:

Source of funding Total expenditures spent on individuals.

Federal funds \$205,828

State funds -0-

All other funds -0-

Total from all sources \$205,828

- c. Budget for current and following fiscal years: Be sure to outline the budget for the current and subsequent years. This item should include a breakdown of dollars expended/allotted for administrative costs (e.g. salaries for personnel, equipment, etc.) and services to individuals and other expenses (e.g., training of staff, travel, etc.). the following chart is recommended:

Category	Current Fiscal Year	Next Fiscal Year
Wages & Salaries	117,935	104,385
Fringe Benefits (FICA, unemployment, etc.)	58,426	50,957
Materials/Supplies	7,911	6,998
Contracts/Leases	34,815	30,874
Travel	7,634	6,792
Equipment Rental/Purchase	4,379	3,705
Indirect Costs Have not yet paid for 2008	1,500	
Miscellaneous	652	617
Total Budget	\$231,752	\$205,828

CAP expenses for FY 2008 were paid using some 2007 funds carried into FY 2008. FY 2008 grant funds were used once the 2007 grant was expended.

The state of Indiana accounting system does not group expenditures in the categories requested (ie postage, telephone, copying, bonding, legal services and etc.) These items are part of one of the categories listed above. For example rent, telecommunications and copy expenses are included in the contracts/lease category and postage costs are included in the supplies category.

d. Number of person-years: "Person-years" refer to the actual time that positions (both professional and clerical) were filled during the period covered by this annual report. If a position was filled throughout the year, it counts as one person-year. Positions filled for any fraction of the fiscal year should be expressed in "full-time equivalents". Person-years should be reported for all CAP personnel whose salaries are paid totally or partially by Section 112 funds. Identify the number of person-years staffing CAP this fiscal year. Be sure to include an explanation of the number of full-time, part-time, and vacant positions. Enter the full-time equivalent for all part-time positions. The following chart is recommended:

Type of position	Full-time equivalent	% of year position filled	Person-years
------------------	----------------------	---------------------------	--------------

Professional			
Full-time	2.5	100%	2.5
Part-time	N/A		
Vacant	N/A		
Clerical			
Full-time	.5	100%	.5
Part-time	N/A		
Vacant	N/A		

e. Summary of presentations made:

The following presentations were completed in the past year:

- 10/19/07 Lake Co. Transition Fair Parent Tract 45
- 2/24/08 Blue River Parents Group (sheltered wkshp.) 45
- 3/12/08 Education Summit for Juvenile Detention 7
- 4/10/08 Greencastle High School Transition Fair 75
- 4/9/08 Gallahue Mental Health Center 22
- 4/16/08 PATINS Assistive Technology Expo. 30
- 4/18/08 Willowbrook VR Staff 6
- 4/21/08 Meridian St. VR Staff 6
- 4/24/08 Brownsburg High School Transition Fair 60
- 5/9/08 Sycamore Services Parent Group and Speedway
- United Methodist Church Parent Group 50
- 5/12/08 East Allen School Corporation 1
- 5/14/08 Monroe County Transition Fair 50
- 5/22/08 Commission on Disproportionality in Youth Ser. 40

6/5/08 NDRN Conference - Providing Quality Customer Service 26
7/17/08 NDRN Teleconference on Financial Means Test 50
7/28/08 Adult Protective Services in Marion County 4
7/29/08 Adult Protective Services in Madison County 3
7/30/08 IRCIL (independent living center) 15
8/25/08 Self-Advocates Group 40
9/8/08 Rehab. Hosp. TBI Support Group 9
9/12/08 Emergency Preparedness for Vulnerable Populations 75
9/27/08 Alliance Industries 14

The following exhibits were completed in the past year:

10/16/07 Northeast Indiana Transition Fair 250
10/19/07 Lake County Transition Fair 500
10/26/07 Bartholomew County Transition Fair 200
11/15/07 Lafayette School Corp. Transition Fair 100
11/27-11/28/07 Governor's Planning Council Annual Conf. 400
12/5-12/6/07 IN. Assoc. of Persons in Supported Emp. 250
3/24/08 Lebanon High School Transition Fair 40
5/17/08 Strengthening Our Roots 100
7/08/08 Black Expo 2008 500
8/6/08 2008 Statewide Transition Conference 550

In addition to the aforementioned presentations and exhibits, the Indiana Client Assistance Program also disseminated the following numbers of informational brochures and newsletters:

CAP brochures (English, Spanish, and Braille) 2,532
IMPACT newsletter 7,396
Toll free resource page 1,674
IPAS Agency brochure 3,752
Family Guide to Transition 615
Funding Assistive Technology via VR 300
Article 7 and IEP Guide 408
Transition brochures specific to school corporations 8100

f. Involvement with advisory boards

1) The CAP Coordinator participated as a member of the Indiana Commission on Rehabilitation Services by attending meetings held in November of 2007 as well those in January, March, May, July, and September of 2008. The CAP Coordinator participated in the development and writing of the VR State Plan in January of 2008 and now serves as the chairperson of the Policy and Procedure Subcommittee for the Commission. This subcommittee functions to review recent administrative hearing decisions as well as VR policies and procedures. Subcommittee discussion during the 7/11 meeting centered on a recent hearing decision involving a client who had requested and been denied hearing aids. This individual worked for a physician specialist whose practice consisted of primarily geriatric patients. The clients job responsibilities included: answering the phones; filing of insurance claims; writing prescriptions as dictated to her by the doctor; and speaking with the patients during their doctor visits. Subcommittee members felt strongly that the VR Counselor had failed to follow Indiana Vocational Rehabilitation Services Policy and Procedure Manual (PPM) 421 as written. Per PPM 421 an individual who is hard of hearing qualifies for VR services based upon measured hearing loss and the effect that hearing loss has on the individual to perform specifically identified essential job functions of the planned employment outcome. The VR Counselor and hearing officer had rendered their decisions based upon the measured hearing loss without taking into consideration how that loss affected this individuals ability to complete her job. The CAP Director was instructed to contact the VR Regional Manager and discuss the lack of evaluation in regards to job functions and commensurate denial

of services. The CAP Director then contacted the client, informed her of her rights under the VR process and Federal Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended; and encouraged her to reapply for VR services. The client did reapply for services, was found eligible, and received her needed hearing aids.

g. Outreach to unserved/underserved populations

1) A presentation was completed at the Building Sustainable Behavioral Health Initiatives in the Latino Community Conference in Angola, IN. titled, Abuse, Neglect, and Violence against Persons with Disabilities within the Latino Community. There were approximately 30 individuals in attendance.

2) The agency Training Director met early in this fiscal year with Carl Ellison, VP and CFO of Indiana Minority Health Coalition to brainstorm on various outreach methods and opportunities that IPAS might focus on within their agency. Further contact will be needed to pursue this option.

3) In July of this year the agency provided information via exhibit booth with the Indiana Civil Rights Commission at the Indiana Black Expo event. Indiana Black Expo, Inc. (IBE) has been a pillar of the African-American community for 37 years as a year-round, multifaceted community service organization with 12 chapters around the state of Indiana. The mission is to be an effective voice and vehicle for the social and economic advancement of African-Americans. This is the largest event of its kind in the nation with attendance reaching up to 350,000 individuals.

4) Outreach for transition aged students continues to be a priority within the agency. A previously developed transition guide was re-formatted and individualized for two large school corporations, RISE in Marion County, and Lake County. These transition guides are intended to serve as a resource for parents and students in Lake County as well as Perry, Decatur, Franklin, and Beech Grove Townships in Marion County. The guide is a tool to be utilized in the development of a students individualized education and transition plans. A total of 5100 books were printed for Rise Learning Center and an additional 5100 books were printed for students in the Lake County area. Additional school corporations are being identified for future development and distribution of transition guides in 2009.

5) All CAP brochures continue to be printed in Spanish as well as Braille for those who require these alternative formats.

h. Alternative dispute resolutions

Although statistics for the fiscal year reflect only "2" cases resolved via "alternative dispute resolution" there were "20" additional cases resolved via "negotiation". In all the Indiana Client Assistance Program was able to work with VR to prevent 23 individuals from going forward with an administrative hearing process to resolve their issues. The CAP program always seeks to exhaust all less formal methods of resolution in regards to a client's issue with VR and other associated projects under the Federal Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended. The CAP Advocates have developed the utmost skills in informal and formal negotiation with VR staff to resolve client issues. VR understands that the CAP Advocates thoroughly research any rights allegations and can provide them with excerpts from either the law or policies that support CAP and client's position.

i. Systemic advocacy

1) CAP continues to assess customer satisfaction by mailing "customer satisfaction" surveys to clients as part of the case closure activity. This information is utilized to determine how services are being delivered and how improvements can be made to provide an even higher quality of services. Listed below are the results of the 2008 CAP Satisfaction Survey.

Grant Program CAP

service requests closed 75 # surveys returned 18 Response rate 24%
How satisfied overall were you with the help you received from the Client Assistance Program?
Very Satisfied 62% Satisfied OK 16% Not Satisfied 22%
If you were not satisfied please check why.
Reason not satisfied with services: # responses
CAP response not prompt 1
CAP services not timely 1
Communications problems 3
CAP didnt explain what they could do 1
CAP staff didnt follow through 2
CAP staff didnt seem to know laws 2
I didnt know what was happening 3
I didnt feel comfortable with CAP staff 1
Other 0
If you were satisfied please check why.
CAP responded promptly 13
CAP services were timely 13
CAP staff listened to what I wanted 13
CAP explained what they could/couldnt do 13
CAP staff followed up on my case 13
CAP seemed to know the laws 16
CAP staff kept me informed what was happening 13
I felt comfortable with CAP staff 12
Other 0
If you had another problem would you use CAP again?
Yes 78% No 22%

Comments offered:
Great Job!
Thanks for the help.
The advocate was honest and I liked that.

2) A meeting was held with both the new Field Services Director of VR Services and Bureau of Rehabilitation Services Director on 3/20/2008 to discuss several issues including ways to increase communication, provision of needed services for beneficiaries wanting to work including hearing aids, vehicle modifications, services for individuals who are blind, as well as various policy and procedure issues. The provision of hearing aids by VR continues to be of particular concern in that VR Counselors continue to deny these to individuals who require them to maintain employment. VR has committed to retrain all field staff in regards to the specific policy concerning the provision of hearing aids to those individuals who need them. Also discussed was the fact that VR intends to have a paperless system within the next few months. IPAS Advocates will need to have electronic access to these records and VR has agreed to such access.

3) During the 7/11/08 meeting of the Indiana Commission on Rehabilitation Services, the Policy and Procedure Subcommittee discussed a recent hearing decision involving a client who had requested and been denied hearing aids. This individual worked for a physician specialist whose practice consisted of primarily geriatric patients. The clients job responsibilities included: answering the phones; filing of insurance claims; writing prescriptions as dictated to her by the doctor; and speaking with the patients during their doctor visits. Subcommittee members felt strongly that the VR Counselor had failed to follow Indiana Vocational Rehabilitation Services Policy and Procedure Manual (PPM) 421 as written. Per PPM 421 an individual who is hard of hearing qualifies for VR services based upon measured hearing loss and the effect that hearing loss has on the individual to perform specifically identified essential job functions of the planned employment outcome. The VR Counselor and hearing officer had rendered their decisions based upon the measured hearing loss without taking into consideration how that loss affected this individuals ability to complete her job. The CAP Director was instructed to contact the VR Regional Manager and discuss the lack of evaluation in regards to job functions and commensurate denial of services. The CAP Director then contacted the client, informed her of her rights under the VR process and Federal Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended; and encouraged her to reapply for

VR services. The client did reapply for services, was found eligible, and received her needed hearing aids. VR then retrained all field staff in Region I in regards to the appropriate application of PPM 421 for individuals requesting hearing aids. A memo was sent from the VR Central Office to all Region Managers encouraging them to evaluate and assure that all field staff were applying PPM 421 as intended and in a consistent manner.

4) CAP has repeatedly expressed concern for the past several years that the VR Policy and Procedure Manual is not clearly written, contains much redundancy, and is not usable for staff in the field. VR did attempt to rewrite the Policy and Procedure Manual as well as individual policies without mitigating any of the aforementioned issues. Indiana VR has within the past few months initiated a formal PPM Reform Project which will dramatically revise their current policy and procedure manual allowing it to be much more understandable and user friendly. VR has requested that the CAP Director assist with the project as the IPAS representative and liaison to the Rehabilitation Commission. The CAP Director has agreed to assist with this most important systems change project.

j. Interesting cases

Case #1

Rita is a forty-five year old individual with bipolar disorder who had accessed services from Indiana Vocational Rehabilitation Services (VR) in 2005 to obtain part-time employment with the National Telecommuting Institute (NTI) through the Javits-Wagner-ODay Program now referred to as the Ability One Program. Rita had an opportunity to accept full-time employment with NTI if VR would send the appropriate paperwork verifying her as severely disabled. She had contacted the local VR office on at least half a dozen occasions but received no response to her request for assistance. Rita then contacted IPAS Client Assistance Program to discuss her ongoing problems with VR. IPAS determined that her VR case had been closed without correct notification and the file had been sent to central VR record repository located in another part of the state. Further, Rita's previous VR Counselor had left employment with that agency failing to follow up on procuring the requested documentation from her therapist attesting to the severity of her disability. IPAS contacted the VR Area Supervisor who reviewed the situation and assigned a new VR Counselor to Rita. The VR Counselor assisted her in the reapplication process and developed a vocational plan so that Rita could receive full time employment and some additional training from NTI. IPAS also assisted in monitoring of the vocational plan to assure that Rita received additional vision and hearing assessments. Rita is now working for NTI full-time after proving herself as a qualified part-time employee.

Case #2

Linda is a fifty-two year old individual with a physical disability. Linda had experienced a significant disc herniation in 2002 while on her job. This injury required surgery and left her with permanent damage as well as restrictions in sitting, standing, lifting, walking, and climbing stairs. Linda had applied for services from Indiana Vocational Rehabilitation Services (VR) in 2003 and was found eligible. An individual plan of employment (IPE) was developed with the vocational goal of becoming a computer consultant. Linda had therefore been attending a college full-time in southeastern Indiana. Linda's IPE allowed for her to purchase school supplies as needed to be paid for by VR. Linda determined that she was unable to carry all of her books needed for the full days schedule of classes due to their weight and her lifting restrictions. Linda therefore purchases three book bags at the cost of \$9.99 apiece so she could sort the books by class and distribute the weight within the three book bags. She would then walk back and forth from the classes to her vehicle parked in the parking lot to obtain the bag containing the books needed for her subsequent classes. Although Linda's VR Counselor agreed to pay for these book bags, the Area Supervisor refused stating that they were not an essential item. The assigned Advocate reviewed Linda's records including her IPE and spoke with Linda as well as the VR Counselor, Area Supervisor, and Regional Manager. VR personnel were unable to cite any policy or federal law prohibiting the VR purchase of these book bags. The Regional Manager even argued that he perceived Linda as needing a rolling cart to allow her to access her books between classes more easily but stood firm in denying her reimbursement for the three book bags. The assigned

Advocate determined, per review of VR policy, and the Federal Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended, that the book bags did indeed relate directly to her disability and vocational goal. VR staff were not agreeable to formal mediation so an administrative hearing was held. The independent hearing officer ruled that the book bags were essential to the clients vocational goal and ruled that VR must reimburse the client for these items.

Case #3

Karl a sixty year old individual with severe degenerative arthritis, severe degenerative disc disease, sciatica, and hearing loss, found it more difficult to continue farming as his condition worsened. Karl applied for services through Indiana Vocational Rehabilitation Services (VR) and an evaluation was completed by Breaking New Ground, a program at Purdue University specializing in assessing and recommending assistive technology for farmers with disabilities. Breaking New Ground recommended several assistive technology items to be provided including an all terrain utility vehicle which would allow him to travel to and from his fields as well as between the rows of crops. Karl and his VR Counselor developed an individual plan of employment (IPE) in 8/2007. This IPE was rejected upon review by the VR Area Supervisor because it contained the purchase of the recommended utility vehicle and Karls vocational goal of farming included the cultivation of multiple crops (hay, trees, soybeans and blueberries) as opposed to a single item.

The VR Counselor apprised Karl of his right to appeal the VR Area Supervisors decision to deny services and provided him with a description of services provided by and contact information for the Client Assistance Program (CAP). Upon completion of a record review, interviews the VR Counselor and the client it was determined that the VR Area Supervisor and not the VR Counselor was denying all of the listed services. IPAS agreed to assist Karl in the monitoring and development of a revised IPE that would be approved and implemented. He agreed to narrow the focus of the original plan by concentrating on the growing and harvesting of blueberries. The plan was agreed upon and signed. In May of 2008 Karls IPE was approved and reflected his choice of self employment as a vocational goal as well as all equipment and supplies needed to allow him to plant, prune, and harvest blueberries.

Case #4

Mary was a 51 year old individual who had profound hearing loss. Mary had been a long term employee with the county Medicaid office and her job duties included daily, frequent contact with the public, both by phone and at the service counter. Marys six year old hearing aids were no longer functional and she therefore applied for services from Indiana Vocational Rehabilitation Services (VR) in late 2007. Mary then contacted IPAS on 1/16/08 after the local VR office denied her request for new hearing aids. The assigned Advocate began her fact finding by speaking with Mary and reviewing the VR file. VR had denied Marys request for hearing aids based upon the agencys interpretation that these would be considered replacement hearing aids and therefore a prohibited service per the Indiana VR Policy and Procedure Manual (PPM). The Advocate determined that replacement hearing aids were not prohibited per either the VR PPM or Federal Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended. Further interview with VR staff revealed that they believed they were unable to provide new hearing aids to Mary because VR PPM 421 and 520 documented that an individual would not be provided with hearing aids unless their job duties had changed or they were in danger of being fired. Record review by the Advocate revealed that VR PPM 421 actually documented that an individual who is hard of hearing qualifies for VR services based upon measured hearing loss and the effect that hearing loss has on the individual to perform specifically identified essential job functions of the planned employment outcome. VR claimed that Marys hearing loss was not significant although audiologic testing revealed she possesses a profound hearing loss); her job duties had not changed over time; and she was not in danger of losing her job. The Advocate interviewed Marys supervisor and determined that Marys job duties had indeed changed over the years she had been employed in the county Medicaid office. The amount of phone work had increased significantly, and while her employer had installed a volume booster on the phone, Mary was forced to remove her barely-working hearing aids in order to answer the phone, often times losing the call. She was also required to work behind a bulletproof glass for her safety when dealing with the public. This created additional

numerous problems as Mary was required to request confidential information at the time of intake and often had to request that applicants speak loudly while in the common waiting area to allow her to hear them. Further the Medicaid office in which Mary worked was scheduled to be moved in the near future and would function as a call center. The Advocate presented the additional information to both the VR Counselor and VR Regional Manager. Mary was found eligible for VR services and provided with the needed hearing aids.

k. On-line information/outreach

The IPAS website, www.IN.gov/ipas, received 60,177 hits during the past fiscal year. Secondary navigation areas and specific informational content continue to be developed to further refine and complete this agency website.

APPROVED:

This Report is Complete and No

Correct. ? [Y/N]:

Date Signed:

Name of Designated Agency

Official:

Title of Designated Agency

Official:

Updated By: painbeechers

Date Last Changed: Dec 5 2008 3:08PM

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number. The valid OMB control number of this information collection is 1820-0528. The time required to complete this information collection is estimated to average 16 hours per response, including the time to review instructions, search existing data sources, gather the data needed, and complete and review the information collection. If you have any comments concerning the accuracy of the time estimate or suggestions for improving this form, please write to: U.S. Department of Education, Washington, D.C. 20202-4760. If you have any comments or concerns regarding the status of your individual submission of this form, write directly to: OSERS/RSA, U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Avenue, S.W., Washington, DC 20202-2800..